

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	11
Project Name	Compton Blvd Et. Al. Project
Project Lead	Los Angeles County
Total Funding Requested	\$3,000,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	11	20	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initially the entire project had a much larger cost. This cost was tied to a full green street and not just the storm water infrastructure portion of that project.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	30	
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	2	12	2	
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing trees then replacing. Is there a net benefit? What are the numbers of trees.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County is targeting 50% matching funds for Regional Projects that are awarded funding
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	
TOTALS	64	110	64	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	12
Project Name	Furman Park Stormwater Capture and Infiltration Project
Project Lead	City of Downev
Total Funding Requested	\$14,670,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	44 To Be determined 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website capacity does not match the project capacity. P. 4 says 8.4AF capacity, p. 16 says 12.84AF capacity, Project Module shows 40AF capacity. Unclear what number should be used for calculation Project developer should provide clarification Low Estimate would be 11 points Revised: applicant confirmed 12 AF storage capacity and Design Capacity of 40AF 24-hour capacity, and infiltration is very high at this site. SC noted that 85th-percentile storm is 12AF. Applicant is designing for 40AF
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	To be determined 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear capacity, would require a re-run of modeling within the project module. User used their own value but provided no modeling analysis. Recommendation is to use the website to run the water supply estimates.
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	9	12	To be determined 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in capacity could change water supply estimates. Require a re-run of the model. Requires a 20 year average, the provided modeling was only for 10 years. Use the website years for modeling analysis. Revised: SC noted that applicant only used 10 years of data, where 20 years was recommended. Sets score to 5 points.
Community Investment	10	10	2 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School improvement, but not part of the school. School adjacent. Unclear if this would benefit the school. There may be a benefit to be school adjacent, but does not meet the intent of this scoring category. Application claimed enhanced or new recreational opportunities. Unclear if this is replacing existing recreational amenities. Revised: project now has 5 benefits
Nature-Based Solutions	12	15	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a verification that items are being added vs replacing what is already there.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	
TOTALS	81	110	To Be Determined 72	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	13
Project Name	John Anson Ford Park Infiltration Cistern
Project Lead	City of Bell Gardens
Total Funding Requested	\$10,000,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	To Be Determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant provided their own modeling results. Applicant claims the water quality benefit of the full build out of all phases of the project. If run through the model, it would likely not be a high water quality score. Would likely score 0 points if run through the model. Possible suggestion to SC would provide a partial credit for different phases of the project. Recommend the applicant redo the modeling for combining Phase 1 & 2.
Water Supply Part 1	10	13	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear if the water is reaching a usable aquifer.
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12	
Community Investment	10	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult to tell what phase these CI benefits are claimed.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant is claiming some portion of Phase 1 funding as part of this projects leveraged funding.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters of support from community organizations or the public. Only letters of support from municipalities.
TOTALS	89	110	Above Threshold	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	14
Project Name	Long Beach Municipal Urban Stormwater Treatment (LB MUST) - Phase 1
Project Lead	City of Long Beach
Total Funding Requested	\$10,800,000
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	30	20	
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	10	10	10	
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	6	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	
TOTALS	70	110	70	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	15
Project Name	Rancho Los Cerritos: Looking Back to Advance Forward
Project Lead	Rancho Los Cerritos
Total Funding Requested	\$2,000,000
Project Type	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	10	30	10	
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	0	12	0	
Community Investment	10	10	5 To Be Determined 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's not on a school property. With Dry Weather project, there should be no flood benefit. Revised: Applicant claims flood benefit for dry weather project. SC noted that justification provided is not applicable to dry-weather projects. SC noted that flooding benefit should be clarified for future rounds of projects. Resubmitted including school partnership letter.
Nature-Based Solutions	13	15	13	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	3	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potentially increase cost share to boost score.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potentially provide a letter of support from the school to potentially increase Community Investment score. Or Formal agreement from school.
TOTALS	60	110	Below Threshold To Be Determined 60	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	16
Project Name	Salt Lake Park Infiltration Cistern
Project Lead	City of Huntington Park
Total Funding Requested	\$2,000,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SC is accepting the revised 600AC drainage area and using that for the following metrics. City is working on an upstream project that will come online in the future to help this drainage area.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	To Be Determined 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant claiming 100% reduction. Should classify downstream bypass to note actual pollutant reductions. Project is between a Dry and Wet weather project. Revised: applicant revised drainage area, and is noting future project to tackle remaining drainage area. SC noted that only the current phase of project is what should be considered. SC using only the reduced drainage area.
Water Supply Part 1	3	13	3 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A cistern was used for the BMP type, use infiltration basin to have the model calculate supply automatically. Revised: SC noted that a secondary project (John Hanson Park) was used as a proxy to develop a ratio of water supply for this project.
Water Supply Part 2	12	12	12 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised: with reduced drainage area, overall supply score drops.
Community Investment	5	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear if "greening" is actual or conceptual greening
Nature-Based Solutions	15	15	15	
Leveraging Funds Part 1	6	6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appears to be a 25% match. Would need a \$2M in match.
Leveraging Funds Part 2	4	4	0 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No community letters of support. Only includes letters of support from cities. Revised: applicant provided community letter of support
TOTALS	95	110	58 To Be Determined 76	

Safe, Clean Water Program

Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2020-2021



SCW.ID	17
Project Name	Spane Park
Project Lead	City of Paramount
Total Funding Requested	\$11,400,000
Project Type	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction cost seems low.
Water Quality Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	30	20 To Be Determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Between a dry and wet weather project. Applicant uses their own modeling results. Web modeling shows around ~50% reductions
Water Supply Part 1	0	13	0	
Water Supply Part 2	5	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application unclear if irrigation needs are offset. Notes potential. Does not affect score.
Community Investment	10	10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not at a school.
Nature-Based Solutions	10	15	10 To Be Determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction of impervious surface could potentially be claimed, may boost score. Does this meet the minimum threshold reduction.
Leveraging Funds Part 1	0	6	0	
Leveraging Funds Part 2	0	4	0	
TOTALS	75	110	60 Above Threshold	